

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action dated February 28, 2005, and the Advisory Action dated May 4, 2005, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-17 have been rejected. Claim 11 has been amended. Claims 18-23 have been added. As such, claims 1-23 are currently pending.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite a web page window having a secondary web page. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in the Specification on page 7 at lines 16-19. New claim 18 recites similar limitations as recited in claim 1, and new claim 20 recites similar limitations to those recited in claim 10. Both claims 18 and 20 further recite a limitation that a translation window is not laid out as a frame prior to the translation window being positioned and sized. Support for this new limitation may be found in the Specification, as for example on page 7 at lines 6-19, and in the figures, *e.g.*, FIGS. 3 and 4. New claims 19 and 21 recite that a web page window is not laid out as a frame prior to the web page window being positioned and sized. Support for this limitation is found in the Specification, as for example on page 7 at lines 6-19, and in the figures, *e.g.*, FIGS. 3 and 4. New claim 22 recites limitations similar to those recited in claim 11, and further recites that a translation window is not opened from a frame layout. Support for this limitation may be found, for example, in the Specification on page 7 at lines 6-19, and in FIGS. 3 and 4. New claim 23 recite that a translation window and a web page window are not initially frames. Support for this limitation may be found in the Specification, *e.g.*, on page 7 at lines 6-19, and in FIGS. 3 and 4.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, and 15-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Word Reference (October 13, 1999), herein after "Word Reference," in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,313,854 issued to Gibson, herein after "Gibson." Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Word Reference in view of Gibson, and

further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,064,951 issued to Park et al., herein after "Park." Claims 7 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Word Reference in view of Gibson, and further in view of "Welcome to the new R-O-Matic Italian/English Dictionary (May 13, 1998), herein after "R-O-Matic Dictionary."

1. Independent claims 1, 10, and their respective dependents

Independent claim 1 recites a system for language translation that includes a translation window that is created by a program associated with a primary web page. This translation window is opened in conjunction with a web page window that contains a secondary web page. The translation window and the web page window are positioned and sized so that the translation window and the web page window fit on one screen without overlapping.

On page 4 of the Final Office Action dated February 28, 2005, the Examiner has acknowledged that Word Reference does not disclose opening a web page window containing a secondary web page wherein the translation window and the web page window are positioned and sized so that the translation window and the web page window fit on one screen without overlapping. However, the Examiner argues that Gibson teaches such a limitation.

It is respectfully submitted that Gibson teaches of frames presented as separate windows (Gibson, column 8 at lines 21-22), but that the separate windows are all child windows associated with a single web page (Gibson, column 8 at lines 24-26). As such, 112a' and 112b' of Fig. 7 of Gibson are each associated with a common web page, *i.e.*, web page 110 of Fig. 6 which is shown as displayed page 110'.

Claim 1 recites that a translation window created by a program associated with a primary web page and a web page window containing a secondary web page are positioned and sized to fit on one screen without overlapping. As shown in FIG. 4 of the instant application, a translation window 400 created by a program hosted by a primary web page is opened in conjunction with a web page window 420 containing a secondary web page 450 (Specification, on page 7 at lines 16-19). The invention of claim 1 teaches two windows that are associated with

different web pages and are sized to fit on one screen without overlapping, whereas Gibson appears to describe windows that are associated with a single web page. The Applicants submit that contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Gibson does not overcome the deficiencies of Word Reference with respect to teaching of a translation window (created by a program associated with a primary web page) and a web page window (containing a secondary web page) that are positioned and sized to fit on one screen without overlapping. Accordingly, claim 1 should be allowable over a combination of Word Reference and Gibson for at least this reason.

It is noted that although Gibson mentions that separate parent browsers may be generated for each frame, and that a windowed frame fully occupies the viewable area in any given browser (Gibson, column 9 a lines 34-41), there is no teaching or suggestion that these frames would be associated with more than a single web page. Gibson describes that windows corresponding to frames are associated with a single web page (Gibson, column 8 at lines 6-43). As such, the generation of separate parent browsers for frames associated with a single web page does not teach the invention of claim 1.

Claims 2-9 each depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are, therefore, each believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reason set forth above with respect to claim 1. Each of these dependent claims recites additional limitations which, when considered in light of claim 1, are believed to further distinguish the claimed invention over the cited art.

Independent claim 10 recites similar limitations as recited in claim 1. As such, claim 10 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reason set forth above with respect to claim 1.

2. *Independent claim 11 and its dependents*

Claim 11 recites a method for language translation that includes providing a translation window that is generated by a program associated with a primary web page, and opening the translation window in conjunction with a web page window. The size and the position of the

translation window are adjusted so that the translation window and the web page window fit on one user-viewable screen. As amended, claim 11 recites that the web page window contains a secondary web page.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Gibson describes frames presented as separate windows (Gibson, column 8 at lines 21-22). However, the separate windows are all child windows associated with a single web page (Gibson, column 8 at lines 24-26). Gibson does not teach or suggest windows associated with different web pages being such that a first (translation) window generated by a program associated with a primary web page has its size and position adjusted to fit on one user-viewable screen with a second web page window that contains a secondary web page. Neither Word Reference nor Gibson, alone or in combination, teach or suggest such a feature. Accordingly, claim 11 is believed to be allowable for at least this reason.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited art also does not teach or suggest adjusting the size and the position of a translation window associated with a primary web page so that the translation window and a web page window containing a secondary web page fit on one user-viewable screen. Gibson discusses resizing windowed frames associated with a single web page (Gibson, column 8 at lines 50-54), but does not suggest resizing any window created by a program associated with one web page to fit on one screen with a web page window containing a secondary web page. Therefore, claim 11 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least this additional reason as well.

Claims 12-17 depend directly from claim 11 and are believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 11. Each of these dependent claims recite additional limitations which, when considered in light of claim 11, are believed to further distinguish the claimed invention over the art of record.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicants believe all the pending claims are in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at (408) 868-4096.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy A. Su
Reg. No. 41,336

AKA CHAN LLP
900 Lafayette Street, Suite 710
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel: 408-701-0035
Fax: 408-608-1599